1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS		
2	EASTERN DIVISION		
3	IN RE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT) MDL No. 3152		
4	ANTITRUST LITIGATION) Master Case No. 25 C 3487		
5) Chicago, Illinois THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO) October 8, 2025		
6	ALL ACTIONS) 1:45 p.m.		
7	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - STATUS HEARING		
8	BEFORE THE HONORABLE SARA L. ELLIS		
9	APPEARANCES:		
10	For the Plaintiffs: BERGER MONTAGUE PC BY: MR. ZACHARY D. CAPLAN		
11	1818 Market Street, Suite 3600 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103		
12	EDELSON PC		
13	BY: MS. NATASHA J. FERNÁNDEZ-SILBER 350 North LaSalle Street, 14th Floor		
14	Chicago, Illinois 60654		
15	HAUSFELD LLP BY: MS. SWATHI BOJEDLA		
16	1200 17th Street, NW, Suite 600 Washington, DC 20036		
17	DiCELLO LEVITT LLC		
18	BY: MR. ALEXANDER E. BARNETT 485 Lexington Avenue, Suite 1001		
19	New York, New York 10017		
20	LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN PLLP BY: MR. JOSEPH C. BOURNE		
21	100 Washington Avenue S, Suite 2200 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401		
22	GARWIN GERSTEIN & FISHER LLP		
23	BY: MR. SAMUEL E. BONDEROFF 88 Pine Street, 10th Floor		
24	New York, New York 10005		
25			

APPEARANCES (Cont'd):	
	CUNEO GILBERT & LADUCA, LLP BY: MR. MICHAEL J. FLANNERY
	Two CityPlace Drive, Second Floor St. Louis, Missouri 63141
	GUSTAFSON GLUEK PLLC
	BY: MR. DANIEL J. NORDIN Canadian Pacific Plaza 120 South Sixth Street, Suite 2600
	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
	NUSSBAUM LAW GROUP, P.C. BY: MS. LINDA P. NUSSBAUM
	1133 Avenue of the Americas, 31st Floor New York, NY 10036
Fan the Defendants	VINCON & FLIXING LLD
For the Detendants:	BY: MR. STEPHEN M. MEDLOCK
	2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 500 West Washington, DC 20037
	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
	BY: MR. BRANDON HANLEY 601 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022
	WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
	BY: MR. JAMES F. HERBISON 35 West Wacker Drive
	Chicago, Illinois 60601
	SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP BY: MR. ADAM S. PARIS
	1888 Century Park East, Suite 2100 Los Angeles, California 90067
	PAUL HASTINGS LLP BY: MR. CHRISTOPHER C. BREWER
	2050 M Street NW Washington, DC 20036
	MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
	BY: KENNETH M. KLIEBARD 110 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2800
	Chicago, Illinois 60606
	APPEARANCES (Cont'd): For the Defendants:

```
(Proceedings heard in open court:)
 1
             THE CLERK: Case 25 CV 3487, In re: Construction
 2
 3
    Equipment Anti Litigation -- Antitrust Litigation.
 4
             THE COURT: All right. If everybody could put --
 5
             COURT REPORTER:
                              I got them already.
 6
             THE COURT: You got them? Okay. Great.
 7
             First, thank you for your patience today. We've -- we
    have a bit of a crazy day. It's been a crazy week, and it's
 8
 9
    only Wednesday.
10
             I left something on my desk. I'll be right back.
11
        (Pause.)
12
             THE COURT: All right. So having reviewed everything
13
    and after our last hearing, this is the structure that I'm
14
    going to appoint.
15
             So I'm going to appoint DiCello Levitt LLP and
16
    Berger -- is it Montague?
17
             MS. CAPLAN:
                          Montague.
18
             THE COURT: Montague. Okay.
19
             Berger Montague PC as co-lead counsel.
20
             I am also going to appoint a plaintiff steering
21
    committee, and that committee will contain Lockridge Grindal
22
    Nauen?
23
             MR. BORG:
                        Nauen.
24
             THE COURT: Sorry?
25
             MR. BORG: It's Nauen, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Nauen. Thank you.

COURT REPORTER: Your name?

MR. BORG: Joseph Borg.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Fegan Scott; Gustafson Gluek; Garwin Gerstein & Fisher; Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca; and then Samantha Gupta of Freed Kanner London & Millen to the plaintiff steering committee.

And I've got an order to that effect that lays out my reasoning that will issue today, but I appreciate that everybody who put forth their credentials and volunteered to participate in the leadership of this MDL, and it was not easy to choose between all of the candidates. Everyone was extremely well qualified.

But I came to this decision based on looking at the factors of who was kind of integral in investigating the claims in this case and putting it together, who's knowledgeable, well resourced and geographically diverse, who devoted substantial time and effort in identifying and investigating the facts and researching the claims, and that there were several firms that would have been qualified under those factors.

So -- and at this point, I do appreciate the suggestion to appoint settlement counsel, but I think at this point it may be a little premature to go down that road. I am

```
1
    certainly open to it in the future as the case progresses, but
 2
    for now, I want to leave the leadership set as it is currently.
 3
             So let's talk about next steps.
 4
             All right. So the plaintiffs proposed that they file
 5
    a consolidated amended complaint and that you wanted to do
 6
    that.
 7
             So if we set that for November 7th, does that work for
 8
    everybody?
 9
             MR. BARNETT: Yeah.
10
             MR. CAPLAN:
                          Yes.
11
             MR. BARNETT: Well, I shouldn't speak for Mr. Caplan,
12
    because he's at Berger Montague. This is Alex Barnett from
13
    DiCello Levitt.
14
             But I believe that's within the 30 days we had
15
    proposed previously, so --
16
             THE COURT: Okay.
17
             MR. BARNETT: -- that works.
18
             MR. CAPLAN: Yes.
19
             THE COURT: All right. So that is Friday the 7th of
20
    November.
21
              I presume, without having seen any amended complaint
22
    but just knowing how this litigation tends to proceed, that the
23
    defendants are not going to be saying this is the world's best,
24
    most wonderful, most legal -- legally-based complaint, we will
```

simply file an answer, and let's move on.

25

Is --1 2 MR. MEDLOCK: That's a fair assumption, Your Honor. THE COURT: Would that be fair? Okay. 3 So --4 5 COURT REPORTER: Name, please. 6 MR. MEDLOCK: Oh, that's Stephen Medlock from Vinson & 7 Elkins. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So presuming that I'm going to be 9 getting either a motion to dismiss or a motion -- some 10 combination of a motion to compel arbitration and a motion to 11 dismiss, when would defendants like to file their responsive 12 pleading? 13 MR. MEDLOCK: Your Honor, we -- this is Stephen Medlock for Rouse and RB Global. 14 15 We think 60 days afterwards with a little bit of a 16 bump for the holidays makes sense. 17 THE COURT: Sure. 18 MR. MEDLOCK: So we were thinking 63 days, which would 19 put us at January 9th. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 All right. And then plaintiffs' response, when would 22 you want to get that on file? 23 MR. MEDLOCK: Go ahead. 24 MR. BARNETT: No, go ahead, please. I guess we should 25 both come up here, yeah.

```
MR. CAPLAN: I believe we proposed -- well, it would
 1
 2
    have been March 9th, but if an extra three days to March 12th,
 3
    which I don't think is the weekend.
 4
             THE COURT: Let me take a look.
             Yeah, March 12th is a Thursday.
 5
             MR. CAPLAN: Yes.
 6
 7
             THE COURT: Okay.
 8
             And then the defendants' reply?
 9
             MR. MEDLOCK: We were thinking 45 days for that,
10
    Your Honor, which would -- if we're doing March 12th, I think
11
    that would put us at April 26th with the same caveat that I
12
    don't know if that's a weekend.
13
             THE COURT: That's a Sunday, so how about the 27th?
14
             MR. MEDLOCK: We'll take it.
15
             THE COURT: Okay.
16
             And then I will set a ruling date then for August 18th
    at 9:30.
17
18
             Emma, is this yours? That's not going to work, is it?
19
             Okay. We want to say August 4th or end of July?
20
             LAW CLERK: End of July.
21
             THE COURT: Okay. Let's say July 28th. Sorry about
22
    that.
23
             Does that work? Okay.
24
             So July 28th at 9:30.
25
             MR. BARNETT: Your Honor?
```

THE COURT: Yes. 1 MR. BARNETT: If we may. One question about the 2 3 motion to dismiss since there are multiple defendants. 4 haven't spoken with the defendants about it, but obviously we 5 would like to see one brief rather than nine multiple or eight 6 multiple briefs, if possible. 7 THE COURT: So --8 MR. MEDLOCK: We'll certainly do what we can to 9 consolidate. It's just a little hard for me to guarantee that 10 until I see the amended complaint. 11 THE COURT: Yes. So to the extent that the defendants 12 can file one overall brief, that is my preference. Where 13 there's specific claims that might relate to specific 14 defendants and not others, those defendants can file a separate 15 brief as to the issues that relate particularly to them. 16 Does that make sense? MR. MEDLOCK: Yes, that addresses the issue. 17 18 MR. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then the --20 (Counsel conferring.) 21 MR. MEDLOCK: If I may, while we're on briefing, Your Honor. 22 23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MR. MEDLOCK: I think the one thing we would want to

take back and discuss with lead counsel for the plaintiffs is

25

1 page limits. I think we need to see the amended complaint, 2 frankly, to understand that as well. 3 THE COURT: Yeah. And I'm -- you know, I'm not going to hold you to the 15 pages. I'm sure that the complaint is 4 5 going to be --6 MR. MEDLOCK: I would hope it would be slimmer, but I 7 doubt it will be. 8 MR. CAPLAN: I doubt it. 9 THE COURT: I mean, it may be slimmer, but I don't know that you'll be able to do everything you need to do in 15 10 11 And I won't tell you that I'm going to stop reading at 12 page 15 --13 MR. MEDLOCK: Fair enough. 14 THE COURT: -- but, you know, my hope is I would not 15 be looking at a hundred-page motion to dismiss. 16 MR. MEDLOCK: That's my hope, as well, yes. 17 THE COURT: Right? So brevity is a virtue. 18 MR. MEDLOCK: Mm-hmm. Understood. 19 THE COURT: And it would be good to practice that. 20 But, you know, nobody needs to file a motion for excess pages. 21 It's understood. Just don't drown me in paper, right? Understood, Your Honor. 22 MR. MEDLOCK: 23 MR. BARNETT: Absolutely. 24 THE COURT: Okay. What is -- what's the plaintiffs' 25 position on discovery pending the motion to dismiss?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just wanted to put it out there.

MR. CAPLAN: Your Honor, in the status report we put in on August 19th, we had proposed that 45 days from today, you know, we could spend that time to discuss with defense counsel if they were open to proceeding on anything. And we could come back to you at that point with an update. THE COURT: Okay. All right. So at this point, I won't -- I'm not going to touch discovery. I'm not going to say that I'm staying it or not staying it. We can come back and talk about it. So why don't we -- are you planning to talk to each other and come up with a proposal within 45 days, or when would you like to come back and see me? MR. MEDLOCK: We're happy to do that on the defense side, Your Honor. I just want to be transparent with the Court. We are likely to ask that, you know, all or nearly all discovery be stayed pending the resolution of the motion to dismiss. THE COURT: Oh, I know. MR. MEDLOCK: Sure. Yes. THE COURT: It's not a surprises. MR. MEDLOCK: Yes. THE COURT: This isn't my first rodeo. MR. MEDLOCK: I didn't think I was surprising you, but

THE COURT: Yeah, not my first rodeo. Generally the

1 defendants don't want any discovery and plaintiffs want everything under the sun to start yesterday, and we generally 2 3 come somewhere in the middle. 4 MR. MEDLOCK: Yes. 5 THE COURT: So why don't -- so why don't you file a status report before me on discovery and identify where you can 6 7 kind of reach some common ground. There may be -- especially 8 on the arbitration issue, which I know I had talked to you 9 about kind of doing that informally ahead of time. There may 10 be limited areas where discovery is appropriate to get started, 11 or there may be a claim that we know is going to make it 12 through and wouldn't hurt to at least get started on written 13 discovery on that. 14 So why don't you give me a status report by -- how 15 about by November 14th? 16 MR. BARNETT: Okay. Very good. Thank you, Your 17 Honor. 18 MR. MEDLOCK: Thank you. 19 THE COURT: And then I will see you back --20 MR. MEDLOCK: Your Honor, just one -- one note about the 14th. 21 22 From the defense perspective, we get the amended 23 complaint on the 7th. 24 THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MR. MEDLOCK: And then that gives us only a week to

25

1 really analyze. 2 THE COURT: Oh, all right. How about the -- do you 3 want to say the 21st? 4 MR. MEDLOCK: That would be preferable. Thank you. THE COURT: Sure. 5 6 And then why don't I see the parties back here 7 December 2nd? And that will be at -- how about 10:30? 8 MR. MEDLOCK: Thank you. 9 MR. BARNETT: And, Your Honor, if I may, just to 10 clarify, the 2nd will be to discuss the discovery issues that 11 we have identified? 12 THE COURT: Yes. 13 MR. BARNETT: Okay. 14 THE COURT: So if -- you know, if you give me a status 15 report that says we agree and life is copacetic, this is what 16 we're going to do and this is what we propose and how we 17 propose to do it and the dates, I will say thank you very much, 18 and I will cancel the status date and simply enter an order. 19 If, as I suspect but deeply hope won't happen, is 20 there are areas where you can't see eye to eye, then I'll put 21 this on and see you and we'll decide where to go from there. 22 MR. MEDLOCK: Thank you. 23 MR. BARNETT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Am I missing anything? Anything

24

25

else we need to cover?

```
MR. BARNETT: If I may. And I don't mean to
 1
 2
    complicate things potentially.
 3
             THE COURT: No.
             MR. BARNETT:
                           But with respect to the page limits on
 4
    the motion to dismiss briefing, you said we don't need to file
 5
 6
    a motion for expansion, but would you like the parties to work
 7
    out a stipulation amongst ourselves and file that with you?
 8
             THE COURT: Sure.
 9
             MR. BARNETT: Would that make sense?
             THE COURT: That's fine.
10
11
             MR. BARNETT: So that way we are working from the same
12
    song sheet amongst ourselves?
13
             THE COURT: Yep, that's fine.
14
             MR. MEDLOCK:
                           Okav.
             THE COURT: That's fine.
15
16
             MR. MEDLOCK:
                           Okay.
17
                          Should we submit that on the 21st as well
             MR. CAPLAN:
18
    then?
           Of November?
19
             THE COURT: Sure. Yeah.
20
             MR. CAPLAN:
                          Okay.
21
             THE COURT: That's fine.
22
                    Anything I've missed or haven't addressed that
             Okay.
23
    the parties want me to address?
24
             MR. MEDLOCK:
                           Not from the defense perspective.
25
             MR. BARNETT:
                           Thank you, Your Honor.
```